

Handwritten:
#100
K. Nazario
3/17/98

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT : JOHN KOLLAR
SERIAL NO. : 08/567,564
FILED : DECEMBER 5, 1995
FOR : PREPARATION OF DIALKYL PEROXIDES
ART UNIT : 1204
EXAMINER : PORFIRIO NAZARIO-GONZALES

Vertical stamp:
RECEIVED
MAR 19 2023
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS, BOX INTERFERENCE, Washington, D.C. 20231 on March 6, 1998.

JOHN KOLLAR
(Name of Registered Rep.)

John Kollar 3-6-98
(Signature and Date)

STATUS INQUIRY

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
BOX INTERFERENCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

The subtle suggestions of a "Status Inquiry" does not seem to spur the personnel of the US PTO into fulfilling its mandate under the Code of Federal Regulations in accordance with 37 CFR 1.607(b) "When an applicant seeks an interference with a patent, examination of the application, including any appeal to the Board, shall be conducted with "special dispatch" within the Patent and Trademark Office." underlined for emphasis

I am not an attorney, I am a very commercialized inventor of about 60 USA and well over a 1000 worldwide patents. My timeliness experiences with the US PTO on normal patent prosecutions suggest that the "special dispatch" of interference matters has not and is not being complied with based on the following time line of events in the above referenced application.


Applicant has been doubly delayed. Applicant can and has fired incompetent attorneys who even with applicants verbal and written resolute requests for prompt response to Office actions have created about a five month delay and even after being dismissed, delayed applicants request for the Office Action papers for 3 weeks.

The following timeline of activity or inactivity is provided for your guidance in assessing whether the "special dispatch" is being administer within the intent and precedent of 37 CFR 1.607(b).

Dec. 5, 1995	Application Filed with Notice that Claims 11-17 of Application correspond exactly with Claims 1-7 of USP 5,371,298. Notice of intent to request an interference with said patent after Serial Number is assigned by US PTO.
Feb. 2, 1996	Serial No. Assigned by US PTO
April 24, 1996	Filing of Request for Interference Papers
May 31, 1996	Status Inquiry "No US PTO Response"
July 31, 1996	Status Inquiry "No US PTO Response"
Jan. 27, 1997	Protest filing by holder of USP 5,371,298
Feb. 13, 1997	Telephone Inquiry "due for action"
April 18, 1997	<u>First US PTO Office Action</u>
Sept. 22, 1997	Response to Office Action
Dec. 12, 1997	Telephone Inquiry by Applicant "next week"
Dec. 17, 1997	Applicant attorneys dismissed
Dec. 19, 1997	Second US PTO Office Action to dismissed attorneys
Jan. 12, 1998	Second US PTO Office Action received by Applicant
Jan. 17, 1998	Response to Second US PTO Office Action
Feb. 23, 1998	Status Inquiry "No US PTO Response"

Please advise the undersigned, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.607(b) as to when a "special dispatch" action can be expected to Applicant's January 17, 1998 Response in the above identified Application.

Respectfully submitted,


JOHN KOLLAR
Applicant

Redox Technologies Inc
6 Spencer Court
Wyckoff, NJ 07481
201 652-8770